

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Applicants originally presented claims 1-15. Subsequently, Applicants canceled claims 4-15 without prejudice in response to a restriction requirement and added new claims 16-32 and amended various claims in response to previous Examiner rejections. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 16-32. In this Preliminary Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 2, 19-21, 23, 26 and 28-32 and adds new claims 33-36 to more clearly define the claimed inventions. Claims 33-36 do not introduce new matter and find support in the specification at least on page 2, line 2 through page 3, line 8; page 4, line 13 through page 5, line 21; and page 7, line 21 through page 9, line 11. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 16-36 are now in the application.

Claims 1-3 and 16-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0123983 ("Riley et al.") further in view of U.S. Patent 6,385,609 ("Barshefsky et al.") and U.S. Patent 6,356,841 ("Hamrick").

Claims 1 and 2, as amended, are patentable over the cited references for the following reasons. First, claims 1 and 2 each recite elements which are not taught or suggested by the cited references. For example, claim 1 recites the step of "generating a report from said standard tables that integrates and shows the performance and activities of the multiple systems, said report including real time information." Similarly, claim 2 recites "generating reports based on said mapped data and said utilizing step, said reports integrating and showing the performance and activities of the host systems, including real time information." None of the cited references teaches or suggests such claim elements. The notification of Riley et al., if considered a report, does not integrate and show the performance and activities of the multiple or host systems as claimed. In fact, the notification is a mere alert, regardless of the form it takes.

Also, claim 1 recites "categorizing said matched data elements to create standard tables that contain information to be used to monitor and measure services provided by the multiple systems to a user of the integrated information technology

services system.” Similarly, claim 2 recites “A method of reporting data related to information technology services provided by multiple distinct host systems to a customer of the services, comprising the steps of: categorizing incidents reported to a service desk by the customer, each incident being categorized by a respective host system to which the incident relates.” None of the cited references teaches or suggests such claim elements. Riley et al., which teaches a detailed methodology for an enhanced service desk operation, is directed to resolving discrete service requests from a customer within an organization of a company (see, for example, paras 0033, 0046, 0061, 0068). Moreover, Riley et al. teaches that the various organizations 23-29 are customers or users of the service desk and not the providers of IT services to a customer (para 0033, last line reads “FIG. 2 illustrates how various user communities, which can be either part of the same organization, or external to it, access the Service Desk to obtain IT services.”). The Service Desk may help to resolve problems concerning the subject matter of other organizations (para 0008-0009) but that is not a teaching or a suggestion of the claimed elements.

Second, it is not obvious to combine the teachings of Riley et al., Barshefsky et al. or Hamrick because the dissimilar objectives of the references do not lead to the claimed inventions as proposed by the Examiner. Riley et al. teaches a detailed methodology for an enhanced service desk operation and is directed to resolving discrete service requests from a customer within an organization of a company. Hamrick relates to a system using GPS to locate remote mobile units and discloses generating reports concerning the tracking of the remote mobile units, including a current location report 1700 that displays real-time or near real time locations. To manage the tasks of remote mobile units, Hamrick has an operational need for reporting real-time or near-real time locations of the units. Riley et al. has no such operational need. Rather, Riley et al. discloses usage of archived information, for example, lessons learned or other valuable knowledge stored in the service desk repository 22 (para 0096 and 0151); reports or statistics gathered as part of a service request closure (para 0148); and qualitative research to determine quality of service (para 0172 and 0194). Therefore, it would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art to combine the references as suggested. Moreover, there is no teaching or disclosure in either Riley et al. or Hamrick on how to modify Riley et al., which

teaches a detailed and precisely defined methodology, especially to achieve the claimed inventions.

Third, Applicants contend that the cited references do not teach or suggest the combinations suggested by the Examiner. Instead, Applicants contend that the Examiner is attempting to selectively combine features found in the references with foreknowledge of the present inventions. Any valid suggestion would have to come from the references themselves but no such suggestion appears in either Riley et al., Barshefsky et al. or Hamrick.

Claims 16-23 and 31; and 3, 24-30 and 32, which are dependent upon claims 1 and 2, respectively, and contain all of the respective limitations thereof, are patentable in the same manner and for the same aforementioned reasons as claims 1 and 2.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 16-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

New claims 33-36 are patentable for similar reasons as those noted by Applicants with respect to claims 1 and 2. For example, claim 33 recites elements which are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Neither Riley et al., Barshefsky et al. or Hamrick discloses deriving, from the integrated data, operational characteristics of the information technology services being provided to a customer. Further, none of the references teaches or suggests presenting those operational characteristics of the information technology services being provided to the customer.

Claims 34-36, which are dependent upon claim 33, and contain all of the respective limitations thereof, are patentable in the same manner and for at least the same aforementioned reasons as claim 33. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that claims 33-36 be allowed.

No fee is required by this amendment. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Account No. 19-2179.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, the instant application is believed to be in proper order for allowance and reconsideration of the application and its early issuance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 30, 2009



Donald B. Paschburg
Reg. No. 33,753

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830
(609) 734-3680